



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/791,589

03/02/2004

Glenn Klecker

DBH:0756,0840

3452

152

7590

10/17/2008

CHERNOFF, VILHAUER, MCCLUNG & STENZEL

1600 ODS TOWER

601 SW SECOND AVENUE

PORTLAND, OR 97204-3157

EXAMINER

PRONE, JASON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/791,589

Applicant(s)

KLECKER ET AL.

Examiner

Jason Daniel Prone

Art Unit

3724

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10, 11, 15-19, 22, 28-31, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28-31 and 33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 8, 11, 15-19 and 34 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7, 10 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8-21-08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Regarding claims 5 and 6, the phrase "rubber-like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "rubber-like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hung et al. (2004/0010924) in view of Thompson et al. (5,483,747) further in view of Shyr (2004/0000058) even further in view of Students (3,834,022). In regards to paragraphs (a) and (c)-(e), Hung et al. disclose the invention (see rejection to claims 2-4, 8, and 15-19 in the previous Office action mailed 31 March 2008).

In regards to paragraph (b), the combination of Hung et al. in view of Thompson et al. discloses the invention (see rejection to claims 2-4 and 8 in the previous Office action mailed 31 March 2008). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Hung et al. with the blade assembly, as taught by Thompson et al., because all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective function and the combination would have yielded predictable results.

In regards to paragraph (e), Hung et al. disclose the invention including a spring urging the jaw and the blade assembly to pivot apart from each other (30).

However, Hung et al. in view of Thompson et al. fail to disclose the jaw defining a cavity surrounding the blade pivot joint and a groove extending away from the cavity, the spring located in the cavity, the spring having a pair of ends, a first end extending into the groove and being engaged with the jaw, and the other end extending outward from and beyond the cavity towards the second handle pivot joint and being engaged with the tang of the blade carrier.

Shyr teaches that it is old and well known in the art of shears to incorporate a groove (62), a spring (42), the spring having a pair of ends (421, 422), a first end extending into the groove and being engaged with the jaw (422), and the other end extending outward from and beyond the cavity towards the second handle pivot joint and being engaged with the tang of the blade carrier (421). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Hung et al. in view of

Thompson et al. with the spring, as taught by Shyr, because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results and all claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective function and the combination would have yielded predictable results.

However, Hung et al. in view of Thompson et al. further in view of Shyr fail to disclose a cavity and the spring having a main part located in the cavity.

Students teaches it is old and well known in the art of pivots points of shears to incorporate a cavity housing a main portion of the spring (Fig. 5). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Hung et al. in view of Thompson et al. further in view of Shyr with the spring cavity, as taught by Students, because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results and all claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective function and the combination would have yielded predictable results.

6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hung et al. in view of in view of Shyr further in view of Students. With regards to paragraphs (a)-(e), Hung et al. discloses the invention (see rejection to claims 15-19 in the previous Office action mailed 31 March 2008). With regards to paragraph (f), the combination of Hung et al. in view of Shyr further in view of Students disclose the invention (see rejection to claim 10 above).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 2-4, 8, 11, 15-19, and 34 are allowed. Upon the entire application being in condition for allowance, claims 28, 30, and 31 would be-rejoined and are allowable due to their dependence off of allowable claims.
8. Claims 5-7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 04 August 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with regards to claims 5-7. The specification does not disclose what structure a rubber-like material incorporates. Basically, it is unclear what allows something to be considered rubber-like. Replacing the term "rubber-like" with "rubber" overcomes the rejection.
10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wendt, Fisher, Cacarillo, Tausendfreundt et al., and Parrish
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Daniel Prone whose telephone number is (571)272-4513. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00 (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on (571) 272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

16 October 2008

/Jason Daniel Prone/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724